

## 2020-21 Academic Assessment Committee

Minutes: 03.23.2021 (3:30 P.M. M.D.T. via Teams)

**Members in Attendance:** J. Laurenz (VPAA); L. Roller (CLAS); J. Petrone (CET), J. Gandonou (COB), A. Parsons (CFA), M. Hardin (Graduate School and CLAS), R. Davis (CET), R. Shepardson (CFA), M. Haney (COB), S. Balch-Lindsay (Administrator),

**Members not in Attendance:** Student Senate Representative (open), Coordinator of Student Learning (open)

- I. Roll Call (from Participant list in TEAMS), 3:34 P.M. MST
- II. Approval of the Agenda (03.23.2021): Motion to Approve: M. Haney, 2<sup>nd</sup> by A. Parsons. Unanimous approval by all members in attendance.
- III. Approval of the Minutes (01.16.2021): Motion to Approve: J. Gandonou, 2<sup>nd</sup> M. Haney. 7 aye/ -0- no/ 1 abstention.
- IV. Old Business (none).
- V. New Business: Role in Program Review (03.23.2021).

Chairperson Petrone asked for a volunteer member of the committee to serve as secretary. Members are encouraged to email him and Balch-Lindsay to volunteer.

Members conducted an open discussion of the process of review to support Program Review (PR) committee's work, with goal to be more proactive in assisting programs undergoing review prepare its assessment for the five-year review process. Ideas presented and discussed included

Undertaking a preliminary review of assessment section of the PR report for each program undergoing the process for the Academic year (AY) review cycle in the fall semester:

Veteran members of the Assessment Committee agreed *that incompleteness of the section on assessment has been an issue for reviewers of some programs, both for the Assessment committee's analysis and feedback and for the PR committee as well.* The goal of pre-review would not be to comment on content or results of the assessment section, but would focus on: ORGANIZATION and CLARITY.

**ORGANIZATION** (e.g. Are the Program Learning Outcomes clearly identified? Is the assessment data *complete* for each of the required years to be covered in the review? Is the annual data organized clearly for review)?

**CLARITY** (e.g. Are the results of assessment of Program Learning Outcomes discussed for the entire period of the PR cycle (this is a 5-year review, and thus the report results should discuss that entire cycle of assessment since the last review, etc.)?)

Committee members agreed that a "pre-review" service to the programs would be useful to the programs, and to the quality of the PR report overall. *Development of a checklist to share back to the program to help identify areas of strength and areas of weakness was recommended and generally agreed.*

LOGISTICS: How many years of PE Assessment reporting would the Assessment Committee need to provide meaningful feedback?

5-year? An advantage might be that it would prompt the program to complete that section of their PR report in fall, just after submission of the Program Effectiveness. BUT- depending on the review cycle for PE reporting for each college, the Program may not yet have annual feedback from the College Council or Dean.

4-year? Academic Affairs holds all Program Effectiveness reports submitted by the colleges each year. Collating the previous PE Assessment reports for the programs under review for years 1-4 could allow the Assessment Committee to review PE annual assessment reports and feedback early, to share with the programs as they turn their attention to the PR report in late fall/early spring

1-year? Review only the last AY assessment provided in the PE report for each program and still provide meaningful counsel and feedback?

***Consensus from discussion to review years 1-4, fall prior to spring submission of PR for program use in completing assessment section of PR more effectively. This would serve as a reminder that the PR reporting should be an executive summary of Program Assessment results and actions over the entire span of the PR. Suggestion to ask for programs set for 2021-22 review to volunteer as pilot of this approach.***

***Action Steps:***

**1) Create a RUBRIC/Checklist for this preliminary review, which would include required elements:**

- \*Completeness of reporting for each academic year;**
- \* Clarity of the Program's PRO- clear PRO with measurable outcomes;**
- \* Results of PE assessment of PRO and projected actions over cycle of review periods;**
- \* Results of those projected actions;**
- \*Organizational or editorial suggestions to aid committees and program.**

**2. Create a standard feedback document to report back to program under review that provides explicit standards used for the review (the Rubric, for example) and follows a standard format.**

**3. Provide a list of programs set for 2021-22 review to solicit volunteer(s) for the pilot.**

**VI. As may arise**

For meeting in April 2021, business will include discussion of the second goal of this committee's actions for 2020-21:

**Role in oversight and analysis of institutional assessment, including**

- \*Opportunities for outreach and support: Information sharing to faculty and staff,**
- \*Analysis of trends for curriculum and program quality and improvement,**
- \*Develop regular training opportunities to support professional development.**

Balch-Lindsay secured NSSE data for 2015 and 2018, which is posted in Teams. New Mexico Council of Presidents Program Effectiveness reports are also posted in Teams, showing executive summaries for NM institutions. These are examples of institutional information that could be used to support analysis and dissemination of institutional assessments for faculty and interested parties for this committee's discussion in April.

**VII. Adjournment.** 5:01 PM MST, by motion from L. Roller, 2<sup>nd</sup> by M. Hardin. Unanimous.